

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಗಿಸಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ನೀತಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ್ದು, ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ೧೬೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒಂದು ಕ್ವಿಂಟಾಲ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಕಬ್ಬು ಬೆಲೆಯುವವರಿಗೆ ಲಾಸ್ಟ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಕೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತಪ್ಪು ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಏರಿತು. ೧೬೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದದ್ದು ಈಗ ಕ್ವಿಂಟಾಲ್‌ಗೆ ೬೦೦-೭೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಡೆಲ್ಲಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕೆ.ಜಿ. ಸಕ್ಕರೆಗೆ ೨೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತಪ್ಪು ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾರಣವಲ್ಲ; ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು. ಈ ದೇಶ ದಲ್ಲಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಯಾವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಲು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಯಾಗದ ಹೊರತು ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತೊಡೆದು ಹಾಕದ ಹೊರತು ದೇಶದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ, ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ, ಗುರದ್ವಸ್ತು ವಶಾತ್, ಅಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ವಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನನಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶ ಗನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ, ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನೀಗ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR SPEAKER.—I have received a letter dt. 7th March 1980 from Sri U.B. Borker, Member Legislative Assembly stating that he has resigned Janatha party and joined Congress (I). I have also received a letter dated 7th March 1980 from the Secretary, Legislature Congress Party (I) stating that Sri U.B. Borker has been admitted to the Congress (I) party. Arrangements will be made to change his seat.

Then I would like to give the following ruling.

RULING BY THE SPEAKER

On the 29th of May 1979 Hon'ble Member Sri C.M. Armugham sought my consent to raise a question of privilege against the Chief Justice of the High Court of Karnataka for giving his opinion on a Bill, entitled the Karnataka Civil Services Bill passed by the Houses of Legislature. The contention of Sri Armugham was that the action of the Chief Justice in giving his opinion on the Bill before it was assented to by the Governor involved a question of privilege. According to Sri Armugham, the action of Chief Justice amounts to an interference in the functioning of the Legislature. The member argued

elaborately about the sovereignty of the Legislature, quoting decisions of High Courts and of the Supreme Court in support of this plea. He stated that the Karnataka Civil Services Bill was enacted by the Legislature bas d on the aspirations of the people and of the Legislature. He quoted a judgement of the Supreme Court wherein it is stated, *inter alia* as follows :—

“The Legislature understands and appreciates the need of its own people that its laws are directed to problems made manifest by experience and its discriminations are made upon adequate grounds.”

It was his plea that the duty of the Courts was only to interpret and construe the provisions of an enactment.

The observations of Sri Armugham regarding the sovereignty of the legislature within the four corners of the Constitution were not contested by any members in the House. Hon'ble member Sri Lakshmisagar urged that the point involved in the present case was whether the action of the Chief Justice in giving an opinion when it was sought from him by the Government would involve a question of privilege. He also pointed out that the High Court has no advisory function similar to that of Supreme Court under Article 143 of the Constitution. Hon'ble Members Sri J.H. Patel and Smt. Pramila felt that the Speaker should have withheld his consent even without giving an opportunity the member to make his submission as raising of privilege issue against the Chief Justice in the circumstances of the case would infringe the provisions of Article 211 of the Constitution.

To put the factual position in its correct and proper perspective, at one stage when the matter was being discussed I read to the House the record of proceedings that took place during the course of the reply of the Minister for Law and Social Welfare on 22nd May. According to the proceedings I may request, Sri B.V. Kakkilaya asked the Minister for Law and Social Welfare as to whether the Chief Justice called for the file or was he asked to give his opinion or did he offer his opinion himself without even discussing the matter. The Minister for Law clarified that there was a discussion between the Chief Justice and the Hon'ble Chief Minister and the Chief Minister asked the Minister to send a copy of the Bill to the Chief Justice. The Minister then sent the Bill with the file to the Chief and he expressed his opinion. This is so far as the facts are concerned. I shall now state briefly what the Law of Parliamentary privileges is this subject.

According to May's Parliamentary Practice, Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The Privileges of Parliament are rights which are absolutely enjoyed by individual members, because a House cannot perform its functions without them. In other words privileges are special rights available to Members to enable them to discharge their duties without any fear or favour. With this end in view our Constitution has an article regarding powers/privileges and immunities of the State Legislatures and their Members. The article is as follows.—

Article 194 :—

“(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of the Legislature, there shall be freedom of speech in the Legislature of every State.

(2) No member of the Legislature of a State shall be liable to any proceedings in any court in respect of anything said or any vote given by him in the Legislature or any committee thereof, and no person shall be so liable in respect of the publication by or under the authority of a House of such a Legislature of any report, paper, votes or proceedings.

(3) In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of a State and of the Members and the Committees of a House of such Legislature, shall be such as may from time to time be defined by the Legislature by law, and, until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its members and committees, at the commencement of this Constitution.

(4) The provisions of clauses (1), (2) and (3) shall apply in relation to persons who by virtue of this Constitution have the right to speak in, and otherwise to take part in the proceedings of, a House of the Legislature of a State or any committee thereof as they apply in relation to members of that Legislature.

It has been said that real Parliamentary democracy is impossible without Parliamentary privilege, which in no way separates the Members of Parliament from the ordinary citizen but gives him necessary protection for the carrying out of his parliamentary duties.

There are four aspects of Parliamentary privileges. The first is freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is a privilege essential to every Legislature. Subject to the rules of...procedure a member has complete immunity for whatever he speaks in the House. Adverse reflections on the House add its members in the discharge of their duties in relation to the House and causing obstruction or threats to members in such duties have given rise to complaints of Breach of Privilege. The second aspect is the freedom from arrest. The principle here is that the House should not be denied with the presence of its members for trifling reasons. A member of Legislature cannot be arrested in Civil Cases 40 days before and 40 days after the Session. This Privilege is not available in a criminal case or in a case of preventive detention.

The third aspect is that the Legislature has powers to summon persons and to see papers. The fourth aspect of privilege is that the House has power to punish people for contempt of Legislature.

I have given careful consideration to the notice by Sri. C. M. Armugham and the several arguments advanced by other members on this issue in the light of the facts that have come to light and the concept of privilege as explained above. It has to be seen whether the opinion of Chief Justice has come in the way of the functioning of the Members or the House. In other words, whether there is any obstruction or interference in the work of the House or threat against members in their duties.

When Bills are passed, they are sent to the Governor for obtaining his assent. The powers of the Governor giving assent are embodied in Article 200 of the Constitution. Government has to send the Bills passed by the Houses to the Governor for his assent. Obtaining assent to Bills is not a function of the House. From this it would appear, that there is no question of any obstruction to the Legislature in its functioning. The notice of Sri Armugham does not attract any of the established privileges of the Legislature. I therefore withhold my consent. Since the issue does not come within the ambit of Parliamentary privilege I need not go into the aspect as to whether the provisions of article 211 are attracted. It is also not necessary for me to take into any records as was desired by Sri C.M. Arumugham and some other members. The matter is treated as closed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಧರ್ಮಸಿಂಗ್ (ಪೌರಾಡಳಿತ ಸಚಿವರು)- ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ನಾಯ್ಡು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್ಮುಗಂ ಅವರು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಪುರಸಭೆಯ ಪೌರಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ನಿಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ವಸ್ತುಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆಟ್ರಿಂಗ್ ಕಾರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿದೆನು. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಪೌರಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಯಾವ ತೊಂದ

ರೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹೋದ ತಿಂಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಒಂದೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಮಾಚಾರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಮರಲ್ ಇಸ್ಲಾಂ ಅವರು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸುವರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನೇ ಮುಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಲ ನಿಮಗೆ ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು? ನಾನೀಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಭಾಷಣ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಲು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸುವರು. ನೀವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸದೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ? ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ವರ್ತನೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ಭಾಷಣ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಲು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನೀವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದ್ಯಸ್ಯರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ ಖಂಡ್ರೆ.—ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಮರಲ್ ಇಸ್ಲಾಂ ಅವರು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಬಹುದು.

†SRI QAMARUL ISLAM—Mr. Speaker Sir, when I was going through the Governor's address I found that two things have been promised to be done: two things one is the distribution of essential commodities and bringing down their prices and the other is employment of graduates. These two important issues may be engaging the attention of the Government. At the time of election the Congress (I) party campaigned that they would bring down the prices and make available the essential commodities to the people. The attitude of the Government has changed after they have come to power. The Government has not taken much interest regarding solving of any of these problems including unemployment. In the democratic set up, the people believe in the principles, policies and programmes of the political parties. In the Governor's address, there is a sentence which reads as follows:

“Karnataka has always given a lead in playing special attention to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, backward classes, Minorities and other weaker sections of Society. The existing schemes will not only be continued but also strengthened.”

I do not see any special attention being paid to the needs of these communities. The Chief Minister has taken some issues as challenge. I do not know whether he is going to meet these challenges. It is yet to be seen. Smt. Indira Gandhi is in the habit of making false

promises. He is following his leader. His leader held out many promises during her regime when she was the Prime Minister and no promise was fulfilled. She was telling during that period that backward and minority communities will be protected and their problems will be solved. What is the answer for this. No problem was solved. During 1971 when she came to power, she went on giving all sorts of promises—protection to minorities, providing them educational facilities, trying for social upliftment of these communities, etc., has she really done them?

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—The Hon. Member has stated that she used to make false promises during her regime. This may be removed from the proceedings.

1-30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. member must remember that he is speaking on the Governor's address. He should confine his remarks only to the address and should not depart from it.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—The Governor's address has laid stress for giving special attention to the SCs/STs, backwards and minorities. During the regime of Sri Devaraj Urs, the minorities got so many things done but during the regime of Mrs. Gandhi, the minorities and other communities did not get any reliefs.

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—What is contained in the Governor's address is the Government's view. If she was not champion of these communities; how did she get majority of votes from Muslims, SC/STs during the last mid-term parliamentary elections?

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—Any political party when it is out of power hold out many promises to these weaker sections but the momenta gets elected forget to implement those promises. Mrs. Gandhi had made several promises and those promises were incorporated in the election manifesto. The one such promise contained in the manifesto is to accord Urdu the second official status wherever there are large number of Urdu-speaking people. This is also in tune with the recommendation made by the Gujral Committee.

With regard to the reservation for the Muslims, it pains me to say that the Muslims have been neglected and their chances of entering into government service are very bleak. The Muslims have got some reservation in Kerala State but in Karnataka there is no reservation for the Muslims.

On the eve of the parliamentary election Smt. Indira Gandhi had held out a promise to the Shahi Imam of Jamia Masjid, New Dehli, that if she comes to power she would ensure some reservation to the

Muslims. But I am sorry to say that her promise made to the Imam has remained only as a promise. There are some members in the party of Cong-I who had interferred in the personal law of Muslims. A bill to change the Personal Law of Muslims was introduced in Parliament in the year 1972 but was later dropped by the Janata Party in the year 1978. Again, she was responsible for introducing a Bill in the Parliament to curtail the minority character of the Aligarh Muslim University which is the Only University of Muslims in India.

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—The Hon. Member is making reckless allegations against the Cong-I. He must know that this is not Lok Sabha. This is not the proper House to ventilate his grievances.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—We have studied the mind of Smt. Gandhi. Even the attitude of Mr. Sanjay Gandhi is not at all helpful to the Muslims. He had committed atrocities against the poor Muslims near Turkman Gate. He had ordered for bulldozing the tenements of poor Muslims near Jamia Masjid.

MR. SPEAKER.—Hon. Member must avoid making references to persons who are not present in the House to defend themselves. He must confine his remarks to the Governor's address.

SRI J.H. PATEL —I raise a point of order Sir, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ. ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಯಾರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದೆಂದು ಆದೇಶ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ. ಇನ್ನೊತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಇಂದಿರಾ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪುಟದ ಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ೩೩ ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ವನವಾಸವಿದ್ದವರು ಜನತೆಯನ್ನು ಚಿತ್ರಗೊಳ ಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂತ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆ ರೀತಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯದೇ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಜನ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸಂಜೆಯ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ.ಹೆಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಅವರು ಬೇರೆ ಅಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಧೋರಣೆಗಳು ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಧೋರಣೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನಂತರ ಏನು ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಅಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ. ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಧೋರಣೆಗಳು ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರ ಹಿಡಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು ಅಂತ ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇಡ ಅಂತ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ.—ಅವರ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಇಂದಿರಾ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರ ಧೋರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

MR. SPEAKER.—Personal references must always be avoided.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—I am making a reference to Smt. Indira Gandhi because it is stated in the Governor's address that "Karnataka has always given a lead in paying special attention to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward classes, Minorities and other weaker sections of Society." In this context I feel right in making a reference to Smt. Indira Gandhi. My apprehension is that these promises will not be implemented. We had sufficient experience of Smt. Indira Gandhi in the past. Very recently when Narainpur incident took place in U.P. she personally went there to enquire into the matter and give solace to the victims. In my view her visit to Narainpur is politically motivated. During emergency period when bulldozing took place near Turkman Gate, Sri Sheik Abdulla visited that spot. Sri Sanjay Gandhi who was present at that time did inform Sri Sheik Abdulla that he did not want to see another Pakistan in the heart of Delhi. This is an instance to show whether the Cong-I is interested in the welfare of Muslims in India.

I want a categorical reply from this Government as far as this paragraph as concerned.

SRI M. M. NADAF.—It is on account of such fanatic people that our country was divided into two.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—When article 30 of our Constitution clearly allows certain communities to profess their own religion, they should not try to curtail this freedom. Recently I happened to go through the speech made by the Hon. Minister Sri Ibrahim in which he has stated that he is going to abolish the Wakf Board. This speech has appeared in "Salar" newspaper which is a weekly in our state. I want to know under what provision he is going to abolish this Wakf Board? As hon. members are aware, this Wakf Board Act is a Central Act; the State Government has no authority to abolish the Wakf Board. I feel sorry for such a statement. If this is the attitude of a Minister, how can the minorities be assured of their rights? I want the government to rebut this charge. In the election manifesto, the Muslims have been promised reservation for jobs in the State and Central services. I would like the Government to assure me whether they are going to accord official status to Urdu language where the language is spoken by a majority. I want that in all the Recruitment Committees and other committees, a Muslim member must be represented. If these promises are fulfilled, then I will certainly acknowledge Sri Gundu Rao as the champion of minorities. But what have we seen in the 11 years of Indira Gandhi's rule? Only one thing we have seen i.e., a muslim has been elevated as the President of India.

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—Is it the first time? The hon. Member must be knowing that two muslims had been appointed as Presidents of India. This shows that the present regime is very helpful to muslims.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—I am interested only in the solution of the problems which are faced by the muslims. Atleast we want that their problems should be solved step by step. It will not be wrong if I were to say that for the last 30 years no scheme was brought forward for the upliftment of the Muslims. Why I insist for according a status of official language to Urdu, is because we find that our culture is involved in it.

SRI BHIMANNA KHANDRE.—The hon. Member is wrong in saying that Urdu is their culture. He cannot arrogate to himself that Urdu is the language of Muslims only; Urdu is an Indian language; non-muslims are also experts in this language.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please don't carry on conversation across the table.

SRI QAMARUL ISLAM.—I will conclude my speech, Sir, But before concluding, I would like to request the Government to reply to the points raised by me regarding adequate representation to Muslims and according official status to under language.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. SPEAKER.—According to the decision taken by the Business Advisory Committee, we have to conclude the discussion on Governor's Address today. The Business Advisory Committee which met yesterday have recommended that the House may adjourn on 15th March, 1980 as scheduled and reassemble on 27th March, 1980.

The following programme has been suggested :

8th March, 1980	Discussion on the motion of Thanks.
10th March, 1980	Presentation of Budget for the year 1980-81.
11th March, 1980	Reply to the debate on the motion of thanks and discussion on the Special motion regarding Dissolution of State Assemblies.
12th March, 1980	Voting of demands for Grants on Account.